

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Before the  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of )

Reexamination of the Policy )  
Statement on Comparative )  
Broadcast Hearings )

GC Docket No. 92-52  
RM-7739, RM-7740,  
RM-7741

To: The Commission

COMMENTS

Heidelberg-Stone Broadcasting Co., an applicant for a new FM broadcast station to serve Goodlettsville, Tennessee (File No. BPH-861217MA) by counsel herewith submits its Comments in response to the Commission's Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (FCC 94-167), released June 22, 1994, as follows:

1. In its Second Further Notice the Commission seeks comment on how the Commission can comply with Bechtel v. FCC, 1 F.3d 875 (D.C. Cir. 1993), which ruled unlawful the integration of ownership into management criterion, which the Commission had utilized in deciding comparative cases.

2. The Commission seeks comment on what objective and rational criteria can be used to evaluate applicants' comparative qualifications in light of Bechtel. In that regard the Commission has requested that commenters address the issue of the impact of Bechtel on the continued utilization by the Commission of the existing comparative factors of local residence, participation in local civic activities, minority status and broadcast experience,

No. of Copies rec'd 044  
List ABCDE

each of which, since 1965, have been considered to enhance integration.

3. As an initial matter, nothing in Bechtel indicates that the Commission cannot continue to decide cases on the basis of those comparative factors. Indeed, the Court in Bechtel attacked the integration policy in part because it had been applied in that case to preclude Ms. Bechtel from receiving comparative credit for her otherwise relevant residence and civic participation. Bechtel at 12. Thus, inasmuch as Bechtel does not indicate that the Commission cannot continue to consider the comparative factors of residence, civic participation, minority ownership or broadcast experience, it affords the Commission no basis for modifying those comparative factors or the weight accorded them.

4. Secondly, as the Commission recognized in its Notice of Proposed Rulemaking ("NPR") in this proceeding, there exists no inherent impediment to applying the existing comparative factors residence, civic participation, minority ownership or broadcast experience, in the absence of the integration criterion, which it had already proposed to eliminate. NPR at 2672. Furthermore, with the exception of the minority preference, all of the comparative factors pre-date the Commission's Policy Statement on Comparative Broadcast Hearings, 1 FCC2d 393 (1965) and, prior to its adoption in 1965, were accorded credit without regard to integration. Accordingly, inasmuch as they have previously been applied by the Commission without regard for integration, any

contention that they are fundamentally dependent upon integration or that integration credit is a prerequisite to their application must be rejected, as must any contention that their continued application has been undermined by Bechtel.

5. Therefore, inasmuch as Bechtel affords no basis for modifying the existing comparative factors (with the exception of the integration criterion) or the weight accorded them, and inasmuch as the continued application of the existing comparative factors is in no manner dependent upon the integration criterion, there exists no impediment to the continued application of those criteria and they should continued to be applied. This is especially the case with respect to all pending proceedings, where applicants have filed and prosecuted their applications with settled expectations regarding the criteria upon which their cases are to be decided. Therefore, until and unless the existing comparative factors are ruled unlawful by the Courts, the Commission should continue to apply them consistently and without modification in all pending cases.

6. While the Commission now seeks comment on the procedural ramifications of applying a revised comparative analysis to pending cases, it represented in the NPR its intention to "apply the revised criteria to all applicants not in hearing as of the effective date of our action in this proceeding." NPR at 2669. Furthermore, at Note 17 to the NPR the Commission indicated that the application of comparative criteria in all pending cases would be addressed through adjudication, on a case by case basis.

NPR at 2672.

7. In addition the Commission has long recognized that the public interest is served through expedition of the licensing process and disserved by unduly lengthy proceedings. Thus, the Commission must consider the fact that, with the exception of the proposed "finders preference," <sup>1</sup>/ any attempt to apply modified comparative criteria to pending cases would result in significant delay, inasmuch as further evidentiary proceeding would be required with the attendant delays of discovery, hearings and subsequent appeals. In a pending proceeding such as that in which Heidelberg-Stone Broadcasting Co. is an applicant, this could add years to the resolution of a proceeding, which already has already consumed over seven years. <sup>2</sup>/

8. The Commission has requested that commentors indicate under what circumstances it would be appropriate to permit applicants in pending cases to amend their proposals in light of newly adopted standards and when further evidentiary proceedings

---

1. Were the the finder's preference properly restricted to those applicants or principals of applicants who in their own name sought allocation for the frequency at issue, it could be determined on the basis of official notice of the Commission's own Orders in the rulemaking proceeding in which the frequency at issue was allotted, which would clearly reflect the identity of the petitioner. Indeed, in some pending proceedings, the fact that one of the applicants obtained the allocation of the frequency at issue is already a matter of record. This is the case with respect to the application of Heidelberg-Stone.

2. That case is currently pending on appeal before the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, Case No. 93-1492 and consolidated cases.

would be warranted. As indicated above, the existing criteria must continue to be applied in pending cases. Accordingly, no opportunity to amend based on any existing criteria should be permitted.

9. In the NPR the Commission proposed that applicant's responsible for having the frequency at issue allocated receive a "finders preference." NPR at 2668. Such a preferenced should be adopted in both pending and prospective cases. However, a "finders preference" should be accorded only where either the applicant, itself, or one of its principals in his or her own name was responsible for having the channel at issue allotted. Accordingly, inasmuch as the relevant Notice of Proposed Rulemaking would reflect the identity of the petitioner responsible for having the channel allotted, there would be no need for further evidence or proceedings. Instead, the Commission could simply take official notice of the identity of the petitioner, as reflected in the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking.

10. In the NPR the Commission also requested comment on whether the Anax Doctrine should be retained, noting that it had previously concluded that it would be desirable to reduce the "burdensome litigation" that Anax had spawned "by modifying or eliminating the Anax Doctrine." NPR at 2672 (Note 10). It is abundantly clear that the Anax Doctrine should be abolished, not only because of the fact that it has lead to "burdensome litigation," but because, as reflected in the Court's decision in Bechtel, the application of the Anax Doctrine in comparative

proceedings results in decisions which are inherently arbitrary and capricious. Indeed, inasmuch as one of Ms. Bechtel's primary bases for challenging the Commission's integration criterion was its application of the Anax Policy, <sup>3</sup>/ the Court's decision in Bechtel must be read as undermining the Commission's continued reliance upon the Anax Policy. Accordingly, it should be abolished.

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, the Commission should promptly lift the current "freeze" and direct that the existing comparative criteria, excluding integration, be applied in all pending cases and that the proposed "finder's preference" be adopted in those cases where official notice may be taken as to the identity of the party responsible for having the frequency at issue allotted.

Respectfully Submitted,

HEIDELBERG-STONE BROADCASTING CO.

By: 

Timothy K. Brady  
Its Attorney

P.O. Box 986  
Brentwood, TN 37027-0986  
(615) 371-9367

July 22, 1994

---

3. See: Susan M. Bechtel v. FCC, 957 F.2d 873, 879-80 (D.C. Cir. 1992)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Timothy K. Brady, hereby certify that I have, this 21st day of July, 1994, served a copy of the foregoing Comments by First Class mail, postage prepaid upon the following:

Office of the General Counsel  
FCC  
1919 M Street, NW, Room 610  
Washington, DC 20554



Timothy K. Brady